

SUMMARY OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: January 23, 2003

TO: Ross Dunfee, Steering Committee Chairman
Karen Dinicola, Department of Ecology

COPY: Stormwater Manual Subcommittee Members and Consultant Team

FROM: Dave Moss, Tt/KCM

SUBJECT: **Summary of Stormwater Manual Subcommittee Meeting**
Moses Lake Conference Center
January 16, 2003 9:00 am – 2:00 pm

PROJECT: EASTERN WASHINGTON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
Stormwater Management Technical Manual *and*
Model Municipal NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program

Subcommittee Meeting Attendees: (*attended afternoon session)

Jocelyne Gray – JUB Engineers	Nancy Aldrich – City of Richland
Michelle Brich – HBA of Tri-Cities	Steve Hansen – City of Spokane
Gary Beeman – WSDOT SCR	Don Gatchalian – Yakima County
Ryan Lyyski – City of Ellensburg	Greg Lahti – WSDOT
Gary Nelson – Spokane County	Karen Dinicola – Ecology
Colleen Little – Spokane County	Dave Moss – TetraTech/KCM
Steve Worley – Spokane County	John Kosco* – TetraTech
Paula Cox – Chelan County	Steve Plummer* – Kennewick
Steve King – City of Wenatchee	Bill Moore* – Ecology
Art Tackett – City of Connell	Ross Dunfee* – Benton County
Brad Bogus – Kennedy-Jenks / Pasco	John Knutson* – Yakima County
Dave Klierwer* – JUB / ACEC-Spokane	Lauren Driscoll* – Ecology
Bob Moorhead* – WSTIB	Tom Tebb* – Ecology
Joe Wilson* – City of Richland	Jim Seitz* – AWC
Lucy Peterschmidt* – Spokane County	Don McGahuey* – City of Wenatchee
Lloyd Brewer* – City of Spokane	Lars Hendron* – City of Spokane

PURPOSE OF MEETING:

This meeting was held to gather the Manual subcommittee, Model Program subcommittee, and at-large members to begin review of public comments and prepare responses for updating the project documents.

AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING:

1. Joint meeting – Ross Dunfee to review status and process for project completion (*15 minutes*)
2. Review/Confirm Agenda for Today's Meeting
3. Review Schedule for Manual Subcommittee for next 6 months
4. Discuss Status of Consultant Team, including Specialty Consultants
5. Review Public Comments on: General, Bibliography, Core Elements #1, #2, #3, #7, #8, Chapters 1 & 3
6. Lunch
7. 15-Minute Presentations by WSTIB, 10-Cities, ACEC-Spokane
8. Next meeting: date, time and agenda

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

1. Subcommittee introductions; sign-in.
2. The Manual subcommittee briefly met with the Model Program subcommittee for introductions and status on the project. Ross Dunfee thanked everyone for attending and acknowledged all the great work the subcommittees had done in the last 14 months! Ross reminded all that we originally agreed a 100% complete Manual was not achievable within our timeframe and budget. If we achieved 80% or 85% or a bit better, that would be an outstanding accomplishment. So move forward to improve, but don't try to reach perfection.
3. Ross then noted that in today's activities, the Model Program subcommittee was scheduled to complete their review in the morning, and are invited to join the Manual subcommittee in the afternoon. At minimum, all Steering Committee members on the Model Program subcommittee should attend the afternoon session for this meeting, and all future Manual meetings.
4. Dave Moss distributed a schedule for the future meetings, through June 2003. It was agreed that the Task 2.7.2.4 presentation for the Feb. 13th meeting by the Biological Specialty Consultant (who had not yet been hired) was optional. We hoped to have them hired by February 13th and they would attend the March 13th meeting. The Hydrologic Specialty Consultant (Tony Righellis) had met with the TAG in Ellensburg on January 9th, and was scheduled to meet with the full Manual subcommittee on March 13th and April 17th. A sign-up list was passed around the room to allow others not currently on the TAG to join in the e-mail dialogue with Tony Righellis. Several additional attendees signed up. Steve King will soon send out an e-mail to confirm the list of members for the Stormwater Hydrology Discussion Group. Then Tony Righellis will contact the group and summarize his work to date and his upcoming activities. And finally, the work to be done by Mark Ewbank (Herrera) for updating/completing the BMP cost estimates for Wenatchee, Spokane, Kennewick, and Pullman, would be presented in April and May 2003. Mark's efforts for modeling would be assisted by members of the subcommittee, especially for Wenatchee, Spokane, and Kennewick.
5. Karen Dinicola mentioned Ecology was working with Tetra Tech to finalize a \$100,000 amendment to perform some continuing and new work on the Manual in 2003. Existing budget would be used to complete the Model Program and address most of the comments and responses on the Manual. The new work would provide for additional meetings, Specialty Consultants, expanded additions/edits to several chapters (particularly Chapters 4, 5 and 6), and ongoing Public Information activities, including a third newsletter. The Consultant Team's support for the second round of Public Workshops was included in the scope, but budget was not available at this time. Hopefully Ecology can allocate some additional funds by mid-2003.

6. Steve Worley then led the discussion and process of going through comments and draft responses for the selected sections of the Manual, in the following order: General Comments on the Manual; Bibliography; Core Elements #1, #2, #3, #7, & #8; Chapter 1; and Chapter 3. [Prior to the meeting, a copy of all the comments received for each section had been collated by Karen Dinicola. Several subcommittee members had then discussed/proposed draft responses. These were typed into the document and sent to the members prior to the meeting.] In today's meeting, the Manual subcommittee then reviewed each comment and each response and either agreed or edited the response. A few responses were deferred to later meetings when related discussion was scheduled to take place. The details of all the discussion are captured in the draft (single document), and then in the updated version (split into two documents), for the original Comments/Responses document for the day's topics. The draft responses were formatted as follows:

COMMENT NOTED: means the comment has been taken into consideration but generally no change to the document is suggested at this time

RESPONSE: the change suggested in the comment is either accepted or rejected as described

SUGGESTED RESPONSE: followed by a draft response to be considered by the subcommittee

SUBCOMMITTEE TO DISCUSS: the comment should be addressed, but no suggested change is proposed yet – requires discussion by the subcommittee [which was accomplished in the meeting].

Again, the detailed discussion is not summarize herewith, but rather in the Comments/Responses document sent to each subcommittee member (and posted on the FTP site).

7. The Model Program subcommittee joined the Manual subcommittee just before lunch. Since the morning's activities went faster than scheduled, the group took an hour lunch and began again at 1:00pm.
8. Several groups that had submitted public comments, but whom were not always represented at the subcommittee meetings, and/or who had considerable comments, were invited to present a summary of their key issues, and suggest strategies for resolution. The four invited groups were as follows:

<u>Name of Group or Agency</u>	<u>Represented by</u>
Ten-Cities / Pasco	Brad Bogus – Kennedy/Jenks
Transportation Improvement Board	Bob Moorhead – WSTIB
ACEC - Spokane	Dave Kliever – JUB
U. S. Postal Service - USPS	(determined their issues were UIC-related)

- A. Brad Bogus spoke first, noting he was officially representing Pasco, but several other cities were involved with his efforts. He didn't have any solutions, but wanted to highlight several key concerns:
- First was their concern regarding UIC issues. (It was suggested Brad get involved with the separate UIC committee, since UIC feedback will likely come back into the Manual.)
 - Brad noted the jurisdictions wanted flexibility; local control.
 - Thresholds were sometimes questionable; some of the percentages and square footages seemed inappropriate for eastern Washington. They will ask for specific references for validation.
 - For construction permits, they wanted the process responsibilities to be clearly defined.
- B. Bob Moorhead represented the Washington State Transportation Improvement Board (WSTIB), and discussed two key issues. First, they were concerned that small cities wouldn't have enough money to pay for stormwater improvements as part of the road overlay projects that WSTIB funds. Bob proposed that stormwater improvements be required when the street was reconstructed, not when it was converted

from gravel to BST or BST to asphalt. Second, WSTIB requested that all sidewalks be exempted from water quality treatment. No decisions were made in the meeting. The issue will be considered during the update of Chapter 2.

C. Dave Kliewer spoke on behalf of ACEC-Spokane. Their concerns include the following:

- Want better science to support the hydrology in Chapter 4
- They don't have expertise to fully understand all the details
- Want assurances that proposed methods do apply
- Don't see why existing practices aren't okay; want to use existing methods
- Consider a phase-in of new methods, especially if they are mandated
- Believe the Manual will take on a life of its own
- Glad to hear an expert consultant is hired to assist; don't stop short... finish the Manual
- Concerned that Idaho may have development advantages over eastern Washington if requirements are too stringent.

D. The U. S. Postal Service did not send a representative, because they agreed their concerns were mostly about UIC regulations, and they were invited to participate with the separate UIC group instead.

9. Ross Dunfee then summarized that the Model Program subcommittee was completed with their meetings. John Kosco and Dave Moss would update the documents and make them ready for submittal to Ecology in early February 2003. Ecology would support the update of Chapter 1 for the Model Program.

10. Meeting adjourned an hour early at 2pm.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING:

The **next meeting** will be at the Moses Lake Conference Center on **January 30, 2003**, from 9am to 3pm. The agenda will include:

- Review of Subcommittee agenda and summary from January 16, 2003 meeting.
- Review/discuss comments and draft responses on the following sections:
 - > Chapter 7, Chapter 8, Chapter 2: Core Element #4, General Comments, and Redevelopment <
- Discuss status of specialty consultants for hydrologic and biological (flow control) issues.
- Other discussion pertinent to making Manual ready for a second public review.

<i>The following notes are from the flip charts (created at the meeting) from participant comments:</i>

No flip charts were created.